

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 12, and 14 are amended and claim 16 is added. By this Amendment, the specification is amended to correct minor informalities and add references to new Figs. 7A and 7B. Also attached is a new sheet of drawings showing Figs. 7A and 7B, the drawings supported by the discussion in the paragraph commencing on page 25, line 17 - page 26, line 4. As agreed at the interview, no new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiners Crenshaw and Hirshfeld in the March 1, 2006 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and, on the same page, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) saying every feature found in the claims must be shown in the drawings. Both the rejection and the objection have been addressed by the amendments to the specification in that paragraph beginning on page 25, line 17, and the new Figs. 7A and 7B. As agreed at the interview, the amendments and new figures are acceptable as the simplest representation.

A disclosure does not need to be so specific that it enumerates all possible ways of doing something if one skilled in the art could readily ascertain or build the invention. The basic requirements of the invention are described in the specification and one skilled in the art would readily understand how to implement those requirements.

Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection of claim 13 and the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte, U.S. Application Publication No. 2003/0041752 A1, in view of Matsumoto et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,765,690 (Matsumoto). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for a printing device comprising a printing medium supporting member having a supporting face for supporting a printing medium; a screen plate used during screen printing fitting detachably onto the supporting face in a state where the printing medium is sandwiched between the screen plate and the supporting face is set printing medium supporting member; and an ink jet head for performing ink jet printing onto set printing medium that has been subjected to screen printing using the screen plate in a state where the printing medium is supported on the supporting face of the printing medium supporting member. Thus, the printing device has both an ink jet printing capability and a screen printing capability. Neither of the applied references shows such a capability.

As discussed at the interview, Witte is directed exclusively to screen printing using a multi-print head screen printing machine. Matsumoto is directed to printing with either one of screen printing or ink jet printing but having a substantially identical appearance when done. This is clearly stated in col. 8, lines 4-13. Nowhere does Matsumoto discuss or suggest both screen printing and ink jet printing on the same print medium. Thus, the only thing that can be said about the combination of the two references is that if one takes the invention of Witte,

directed solely to screen printing, and applies the teachings of Matsumoto, then Witte could produce screen printing that would replicate or show identical colors to printing of the same image using an ink jet. However, there is nothing in either reference or their combination that suggests using both printing techniques on the same printing medium.

At the top of page 5 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 calls for a printing method comprising the steps of screen printing onto a printing medium using a screen plate and ink jet printing by emitting ink of a darker color than the ink used in the screen printing step, onto the screen printed region, from an ink-jet head.

As discussed above, and at the interview, Matsumoto teaches no such thing. Matsumoto teaches printing exclusively using either ink-jet printing or silk screen printing and is directed to having the output look substantially the same. Nowhere does Matsumoto suggest combining the two printing techniques as is found in claim 10 and clearly there is no discussion of a silk screen printing step using a white color as found in claim 11. Thus, Matsumoto does not anticipate the subject matter of claims 10 and 11.

At the top of page 6 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Matsumoto and further in view of Siegeritz, U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0122208; the bottom of the page claims 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Matsumoto and further in view of Koizumi, U.S. Patent No. 6,631,985; and at the bottom of page 7, claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witte in view of Matsumoto and further in view of Thorpe, U.S. Patent No. 4,938,130. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 depend, has been discussed above. Neither Siegeritz nor Koizumi overcomes the deficiencies of the basic combination. Thus, it is respectfully

requested the rejection be withdrawn for all the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited with claims 2-9.

As to the rejection of claims 12-15, Applicant's claim 12 calls for a printing device comprising a printing medium supporting member having a supporting face with supporting a printing medium; a screen plate used during screen printing fitting the supporting face in a state where the printing medium is sandwiched between the screen plate and the supporting face the printing medium supporting member; an ink jet head for performing ink jet printing onto the printing medium that has been subjected to screen printing using the screen plate, in a state where the printing medium is supported on the supporting face as the printing medium supporting member, and a frame wherein the screen plate together with the frame have lock-and-key relationship with the printing medium supporting member. Again the claim calls for both screen printing and ink jet printing.

The basic references to Witte and Matsumoto, as discussed above, do not disclose any such capability, either singly or in combination. Thorpe, which is directed solely to a screen printing registration and device and method, does not overcome the deficiencies of the basic combination and thus the total combination does not suggest the subject matter of claims 12-15. Therefore, it is respectfully requested all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Robert A. Miller

Registration No. 32,771

JAO:RAM/eks

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
New Sheet

Date: March 1, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached new drawing sheet adds Figs. 7A and 7B.

Attachment: New Sheet